UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,463	03/18/2004	Robert Gerlach	2918.RGER.NP	7225

26986 7590 07/09/2008

MORRISS OBRYANT COMPAGNI, P.C.
734 EAST 200 SOUTH
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

EXAMINER	
DUNN, DANIELLE N	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2875	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/804,463	GERLACH, ROBERT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Danielle Dunn	2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 April 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34 and 48-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34 and 48-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment filed on 3/7/2008 has been entered. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 30 and 35-47 have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Claims 1-29, 31-34 and 48-53 are still pending in this application, with claim 1 being independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1, 2, and 20-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthu et al. (US 6,441,558) and further in view of Amerson et al. (US 6,379,022), Bourn et al. (US 6,554,452) and Walter (US 3,757,103).

In regards to **claims 1, 2, and 20-23**, Muthu et al. teach an LED array formed of a plurality of LEDs (Fig. 1, items 22, 24, and 28), with each LED or group of identically colored LEDs. Muthu et al. also teaches that the LED array is used for spotlights/floodlights (Fig. 1). Muthu et al. do not teach the visible spectrum is 400 to 750nm. Amerson et al. teach using an array of four distinct colors (Column 2, lines 66-67). Bourn et al. teach light being emitted from the LEDs being two or more selected

from the following colors: infra-red, red, amber, yellow, green, blue, violet, ultraviolet or white in color (Col. 3, ln 40-45). This anticipates using at least five distinct narrowband colors. The Examiner notes that using an array of four colors creates white light. Adding a fifth color to this array will simulate white light closer to sunlight. It has been a goal of the art to produce white light as similar to the white light emitted by the sun. Likewise, increasing the amount of distinctly colored narrowband colors in the array will simulate white light that is even closer to the white light emitted by the sun. Walter teaches having white light (Figs. 5A-5F) having at least five "bright lines". This teaches having at least five narrowband colors within the visible spectrum in order to simulate white light. Walter also teaches the visible spectrum of light is from 300nm to 750nm (Figs. 5E-5F).

Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al., and Walter do not explicitly teach the relative luminance values for all LEDs within the LED array operating at full brightness levels resulting in a composite white-type light that may be plotted on a CIE Chromaticity diagram within MacAdam ellipses that are on or adjacent to a Planckian Locus within a predefined correlated color temperature range. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that visible light is capable of being plotted on a CIE Chromaticity diagram within McAdams ellipses that are on or adjacent to a Planckian Locus within a predefined correlated color temperature range which is undefined by the Applicant.

Muthu et al. teach each LED or group of identically colored LEDs within the LED array are configured for independent control (Fig. 1 and 4). Muthu et al. teach the plurality of LEDs number less than or equal to 100, 64, 36 and 16 LEDs (Fig. 1).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to use the structure of the white LED luminary light control system of Muthu et al. in combination with any diodes within the visual spectrum as noted by Walter. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to increase the number of uniquely colored LED's or group of identically colored LED's from four to five or more as taught by Bourn et al. in order to create a light that is closer to sunlight of what was created with four or less groups of uniquely colored LED's or group of identically colored LED's as noted by Amerson et al., since additional uniquely colored LEDs would provide greater spectral enhancement approaching sunlight and since it has been held that a mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

3. **Claims 3-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthu et al. (US 6,441,558), Amerson et al. (US 6,379,022), Bourn et al. (US 6,554,452) and Walter (US 3,757,103) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of LEDTRONICS, Inc. (http://web.archive.org/web/20021015160056/http://www.ledtronics.com/datasheets/Pages/general_information/100-02a.htm).

In regards to **claims 3-5**, Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter teach all the limitations as disclosed above. Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter do not teach that the LEDs produces colored light with a spectral half-width

of less than about 60nm, 40nm, or 30nm. LEDTRONICS, Inc. teach LEDs that produce colored light with a spectral half-width of about 90nm, 65nm, 60nm, 50nm, 45nm, 35nm, 30nm, and 20nm. Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to use the LEDs of LEDTRONICS for the array of LEDs of Muthu et al. within the visible spectrum as noted by Walter since the LEDs of LEDTRONICS provide a greater range of spectral emissions in order to achieve white light.

4. **Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthu et al. (US 6,441,558), Amerson et al. (US 6,379,022), Bourn et al. (US 6,554,452) and Walter (US 3,757,103), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of LEDTRONICS, Inc. (http://web.archive.org/web/20020927061148/http://www.ledtronics.com/datasheets/Pages/led_color_chart/38.htm)

In regards to **claims 6, 9, and 12**, Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter teach all the limitations as disclosed above. Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter do not teach specified colors within 25nm of associated dominant wavelengths. LEDTRONICS, Inc. teaches the following specified colors within 25nm of an associated dominant wavelength violet 425 nm (ultra violet 405nm), blue 465 nm (super blue 470nm), cyan 500 nm (blue green 505nm), green 530 nm (aqua green 525nm), lime 555 nm (pure green 555nm), amber 580 nm (super lime yellow 574nm), orange 610 nm (super orange 612nm), red 650 nm (ultra red 660nm), violet 405 nm (ultra violet 405nm), indigo 445 nm (ultra blue 430nm), blue 480 nm (super blue

470nm), cyan 510 nm (aqua green 525nm), green 535 nm (pure green 555nm), lime 555 nm (super pure green 560nm), yellow-amber 575 nm (super lime yellow 574nm), orange 600 nm (orange 605nm), orange-red 630 nm (super red 633nm), deep red 665 nm (ultra red 660nm), violet 410 nm (ultra violet 405nm), indigo 445nm (ultra blue 430nm), blue 475 nm (super blue 470nm), cyan 500 nm (blue green 505nm), aqua 520 nm (aqua green 525nm), green 540 nm (pure green 555nm), lime 555 nm (super pure green 560nm), yellow 570 nm (yellow 585nm), amber 590 nm (super yellow 595nm), orange 610 nm (super orange 612nm), red-orange 635 nm (high eff. red 635nm) and deep red 665 nm (ultra red 660nm).

In regards to claims 7, 10, and 13, Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter do not teach specified colors within 15nm of associated dominant wavelengths. LEDTRONICS, Inc. teaches the following specified colors within 15nm of an associated dominant wavelength: violet 425 nm (ultra blue 430nm), blue 465 nm (super blue 470nm), cyan 500 nm (blue green 505nm), green 530 nm (aqua green 525nm), lime 555 nm (pure green 555nm), amber 580 nm (yellow 585nm), orange 610 nm (super orange 612nm), red 650 nm (ultra red 660nm), violet 405 nm (ultra blue 405nm), indigo 445 nm (ultra blue 430nm), blue 480 nm (super blue 470nm), cyan 510 nm (blue green 505nm), green 535 nm (aqua green 525nm), lime 555 nm (super pure green 560nm), yellow-amber 575 nm (super lime yellow 574nm), orange 600 nm (super yellow 595nm), orange-red 630 nm (super red 633nm), deep red 665 nm (ultra red 660nm), violet 410 nm (ultra violet 395nm), indigo 445nm (ultra blue 430nm), blue 475 nm (super blue 470nm), cyan 500 nm (blue green 505nm), aqua 520 nm (aqua green 525nm), green

540 nm (pure green 555nm), lime 555 nm (super pure green 560nm), yellow 570 nm (super lime yellow 574nm), amber 590 nm (super yellow 595nm), orange 610 nm (super orange 620nm), red-orange 635 nm (high eff. red 635nm) and deep red 665 nm (ultra red 660nm).

In regards to **claims 15-19**, Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter do not teach each dominant wavelength being separated from its nearest neighbor on either side by not more than about 40nm, 30nm, or 20nm. LEDTRONICS, Inc. teaches each dominant wavelength being separated from its nearest neighbor on either side by not more than about 40nm, 30nm or 20nm. LEDTRONICS, Inc. teaches the dominant wavelengths gradually increasing away from either side of approximately 555nm. 560 nm, 564 nm, 569 nm (is gradually increasing in a positive direction) or 528 nm, 502 nm, or 460 nm (is gradually increasing in a negative direction. In this case 560 nm is approximately 555 nm. Furthermore, nanometers is a very small measuring scale, therefore going from 560 nm to 528 nm is gradually increasing in a negative direction. Similarly going from 560 nm to 564 nm is gradually increasing in a positive direction. LEDTRONICS, Inc. teaches LEDs with a dominant wavelength in the near ultra-violet region. One having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the near ultraviolet spectrum is the region of light just below the visible in wavelength (300 nm to 400 nm as defined by Applicant). Turnbull et al. teach the visible spectrum of light is from 380nm to 780nm (Column 6, lines 22-25). There the LEDTRONICs, Inc Discrete LED Color Chart anticipates an LED with a dominate wavelength in the near ultraviolet region as shown for LEDtronics Code 370 whose dominate wavelength is N/A; however it's peak

wavelength is 378 nm which is just below the visual spectrum as defined by Turnbull et al. It is also known in the art the Gallium Nitride (GaN) is in the near ultraviolet range of 250-395 nm. The use of GaN anticipates using an LED in the near ultraviolet range of 300 nm -400 nm. Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to use the LEDs of LEDTRONICS for the array of LEDs of Muthu et al. within the visible spectrum as noted by Turnbull et al. since the LEDs of LEDTRONICS provide a greater range of spectral emissions in order to achieve white light.

5. **Claims 8, 11, and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthu et al. (US 6,441,558), Amerson et al. (US 6,379,022), Bourn et al. (US 6,554,452), Walter (US 3,757,103) and LEDTRONICS, Inc. (http://web.archive.org/web/20020927061148/http://www.ledtronics.com/datasheets/Pages/led_color_chart/38.htm), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of The LED Museum (http://web.archive.org/web/20030201225626/http://ledmuseum.home.att.net/ledleft.htm)

In regards to **claims 8, 11, and 14,** Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter teach all the limitations as disclosed above. Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter do not teach specified colors within 25nm of associated dominant wavelengths. LEDTRONICS, Inc. teaches the following specified colors within 5nm of an associated dominant wavelength: violet 425 nm (ultra blue 430nm), blue 465 nm (super blue 470nm), cyan 500 nm (blue green 505nm), green 530 nm (aqua green

525nm), lime 555 nm (pure green 555nm), amber 580 nm (yellow 585nm), orange 610 nm (super orange 612nm), violet 405 nm (ultra blue 405nm), cyan 510 nm (blue green 505nm), green 535 nm (aqua green 525nm), lime 555 nm (super pure green 560nm), yellow-amber 575 nm (super lime yellow 574nm), orange 600 nm (super yellow 595nm), orange-red 630 nm (super red 633nm), deep red 665 nm (ultra red 660nm), violet 410 nm (ultra violet 405nm), blue 475 nm (super blue 470nm), cyan 500 nm (blue green 505nm), aqua 520 nm (aqua green 525nm), lime 555 nm (super pure green 560nm), yellow 570 nm (super lime yellow 574nm), amber 590 nm (super yellow 595nm), orange 610 nm (super orange 612nm), red-orange 635 nm (high eff. red 635nm) and deep red 665 nm (ultra red 660nm). The LED Museum teaches the following specified colors within 5nm of an associated dominant wavelength: red 650 nm (pure bright red 645nm), indigo 445 nm (deep blue/violet blue 444nm), blue 480 nm (blue, slightly greenish-tinted azure blue 475nm), indigo 445nm (deep blue/violet blue 444nm), green 540 nm (no color seen, but within green wavelength 540nm). Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to use the LEDs of LEDTRONICS for the array of LEDs of Muthu et al. within the visible spectrum as noted by Walter. since the LEDs of LEDTRONICS provide a greater range of spectral emissions in order to achieve white light.

6. **Claims 24-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthu et al. (US 6,441,558), Amerson et al. (US 6,379,022), Bourn et al. (US 6,554,452) and Walter (US 3,757,103) as applied to claim 1 above.

In regards to **claims 24-26**, Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter teach an LED array formed of a plurality of LEDs comprising wavelengths in the visible spectrum having the overall luminance sufficient to illuminate an object from a distance of at least 24 inches. Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter do not teach the amount of power that each of the plurality of LEDs comprise. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to perform testing to acquire the optimal Wattage values because this would ensure that the LEDs would not overheat, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2nd 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

7. **Claims 27-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthu et al. (US 6,441,558), Amerson et al. (US 6,379,022), Bourn et al. (US 6,554,452) and Walter (US 3,757,103) as applied to claim 1 above.

In regards to **claims 27-29**, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that any five or more distinct narrowband colors of LEDs can be plotted and an area enclosed by plotting an output of each LED on a CIE Chromaticity diagram as a point and connecting the points can be generated covering at least 75%, 85% and/or 95% of a total area defined within a curve of spectrally pure colors and an alychne of purple colors.

8. **Claims 31-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthu et al. (US 6,441,558), Amerson et al. (US 6,379,022), Bourn et al. (US 6,554,452) and Walter (US 3,757,103) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of LEDTRONICS, Inc. (http://www.ledtronics.com/datasheets/Pages/chromaticity/097b.htm).

In regards to **claims 31-34**, LEDTRONICS, Inc. teaches the Color Temperature in Kelvin's from 1000°K - ∞°K. 1500°K -25000°K, 3000°K -10000°K, 4500°K -7500°K, 5500°K -6500°K are all optimum or workable ranges, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to use the LEDs of LEDTRONICS for the array of LEDs of Muthu et al. within the visible spectrum as noted by Walter since the LEDs of LEDTRONICS provide a greater range of spectral emissions in order to achieve white light.

9. **Claims 48-53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthu et al. (US 6,441,558), Amerson et al. (US 6,379,022), Bourn et al. (US 6,554,452) and Walter (US 3,757,103), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (http://web.archive.org/web/20020830202832/http://www.mnstate.edu/wasson/ed602pearsoncorr.htm).

Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter teach all the limitations as disclosed above. Muthu et al., Amerson et al., Bourn et al. and Walter do not teach using as specific correlation coefficient. However, Applicant admits, "New claims 48-53 are directed to statistical correlations…The correlation coefficient, also known as the "Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient", is a well known parameter to those of ordinary skill in the art at or before the priority date of the present application" in the Amendment submitted 6/21/2007 on page 27 under the heading New Claims 48-53. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient is a well-known parameter to those of ordinary skill before the priority date of the present application and is therefore considered prior art as shown by Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (http://web.archive.org/web/20020830202832/http://www.mnstate.edu/wasson/ed602pearsoncorr.htm). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have a correlation coefficient between a spectral power distribution of the LED array and a spectral power distribution of midday sunlight being at least .75, .80, .85, .90, or .95 over the visual spectrum, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2nd 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 3/7/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

11. Regarding claim 1, regarding the Turnbull et al. reference, applicants argues that Turnbull et al teaches away from using 5 or more narrowband colored LEDs, however, applicant is reminded that Turnbull et al. was cited merely for its disclosure of the claimed visible light range. The visual spectrum is now cited by Walter (US 3,757,103).

12. In response to Applicant's request for clarification in regards to the obviousness statement for claims 3-5. The obviousness statement is made in combination of claims 3-5 is made in view of its parent claim(s) which claims at least five distinct narrowband colors. One having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that using multiple light sources increases the amount of light emitted to an area or on an object, therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to use the LEDs of LEDTRONICS for the array of LEDs of Muthu et al. within the visible spectrum as noted by Walter since the LEDs of LEDTRONICS provide a greater range of spectral emissions in order to achieve white light. Northrop et al. (US 5,122,710) teach rare earth phosphor blend for fluorescent lamp using four to five phosphors.

13. In response to Applicants request for clarification regarding the rejection of claim 18, the Applicant is reminded that claim 18 calls for dominant wavelengths gradually increasing away from either side of approximately 555 nm. The Examiner has interpreted this to mean the dominate wavelengths do not have to be 555 nm, however they can be 560 nm, 564 nm, 569 nm (which is gradually increasing in a positive direction) or 528 nm, 502 nm, or 460 nm (which is gradually increasing in a negative direction. In this case 560 nm is approximately 555 nm. Furthermore, nanometers is a very small measuring scale, therefore going from 560 nm to 528 nm is gradually

increasing in a negative direction. Similarly going from 560 nm to 564 nm is gradually increasing in a positive direction.

14. In response to Applicants request for clarification regarding the rejection of claim 19, one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the near ultraviolet wavelength of the visual spectrum is the region of light just below the visible wavelengths. Turnbull et al. teach the visible spectrum of light is from 380nm to 780nm (Column 6, lines 22-25). Therefore the LEDTRONICs, Inc Discrete LED Color Chart anticipates an LED with a dominate wavelength in the near ultraviolet region as shown for LEDtronics Code 370 whose dominate wavelength is N/A; however it's peak wavelength is 378 nm which is just below the visual spectrum as defined by Turnbull et al. It is also known in the art the Gallium Nitride (GaN) is in the near ultraviolet range of 250-395 nm. The use of GaN anticipates using an LED in the near ultraviolet range of 300 nm -400 nm.

15. With respect to claims 2, 6-26, 31-34, and 48-53 the applicant presents no arguments, except stating that such claims are dependent upon claim 1 and would be allowable if the independent claim 1 is allowed.

16. Examiner notes that it appears as if Applicant is attempting to claim the entire visual spectrum as plotted on a CIE Chromaticity diagram. The Applicant is required to claim one invention, not all possible/future variations of the invention as Applicant stated during the interview on 9/25/2007.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 3,670,193 teach an electric discharge lamp having spectrium approximating natural daylight, especially in middle and near UV ranges. US 4,647,814 teach a high-power, high-pressure metal halide discharge lamp with improved spectral light distribution. US 4,891,550 teach the visual spectrum and a phosphor blend for broad spectrum fluorescent lamp. US 5,060,118 teach the visual spectrum and an apparatus for daylight color duplication. US 5,122,710 teach rare earth phosphor blend for fluorescent lamp using four to five phosphors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Danielle Dunn whose telephone number is (571)270-3039. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 9:00AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 571-272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sandra L. O'Shea/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2875

DND
6/24/08